weighbeams, poises, and printing devices. Rough handling of these parts shall be avoided.

(4) Poultry growers, live poultry dealers, sellers, or others having legitimate interest in a load of poultry are entitled to observe the balancing, weighing, and recording procedures. A weigher shall not deny such persons that right or withhold from them any information pertaining to the weight. He shall check the zero balance of the scale or reweigh a load of poultry when requested by such parties or duly authorized representatives of the Administrator.

(f) General precautions. (1) The poises of weighbeam scales are carefully adjusted and sealed to a definite weight at the factory and any change in that weight seriously affects weighing accuracy. A weigher, therefore, shall observe if poise parts are broken, loose or lost or if material is added to a poise and shall report any such condition to his superior or employer. Balancing or weighing shall not be performed while a scale ticket is in the slot of a weighbeam poise.

(2) Stops are provided on scale weighbeams to prevent movement of poises back of the zero graduation when balancing or weighing. When the stops become worn or broken and allow a poise to be set behind the zero position, this condition must be reported by the weigher to his superior or employer and corrected without delay.

(3) Motion detection circuits are a part of electronic scales. They are designed to prevent the printing of weight values if the load has not stabilized within prescribed limits. The weighmaster's duty is to print the actual weight of the load within these limits. This requires printing the actual weight of the load, not one of the other weights that may be within the motion detection limits.

(4) Foreign objects or loose material in the form of nuts, bolts, washers, or other material on any part of the weighbeam assembly, including the counter-balance hanger or counter-balance weights, are potential sources of weighing error. Loose balancing material must be enclosed in the shot cup of the counter-balance hanger and counter-balance weights must not be of the slotted type which can readily be removed.

(5) Whenever, for any reason, a weigher has reason to believe that a scale is not functioning properly or not yielding correct weight values, he shall discontinue weighing, report the facts to the parties responsible for scale maintenance and request inspection, test or repair of the scale.

(6) When a scale has been adjusted, modified, or repaired in any manner which can affect the accuracy of weighing or weight recording, the weigher shall not use the scale until it has been tested and inspected and found to be accurate.

[FR Doc. 95–13615 Filed 6–2–95; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 3410–KD–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

14 CFR Part 39

[Docket No. 95–CE–29–AD]

Airworthiness Directives; Piper Aircraft Corporation Model PA–46–350P Airplanes

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration, DOT.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM).

SUMMARY: This document proposes to adopt a new airworthiness directive (AD) that would apply to certain Piper Aircraft Corporation (Piper) Model PA–46–350P airplanes. The proposed action would require installing to the right of the manifold pressure gauge in full view of the pilot a placard that specifies manifold pressure limits, and incorporating a revision into the Limitations section of the Pilots' Operating Handbook (POH). After recent review of the Piper Model PA–46–350P powerplant data, the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) determined that certain manifold pressure limitations should be incorporated. These limitations fall outside the normal continuous operation range of the engine, and therefore testing was not performed in this area during original type certification. The actions specified by the proposed AD are intended to prevent fatigue damage to the propeller caused by operating above certain manifold pressure limits.

DATES: Comments must be received on or before August 11, 1995.

ADDRESSES: Submit comments in triplicate to the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), Central Region, Office of the Assistant Chief Counsel, Attention: Rules Docket No. 95–CE–29–AD, Room 1558, 601 E. 12th Street, Kansas City, Missouri 64106. Comments may be inspected at this location between 8 a.m. and 4 p.m., Monday through Friday, holidays excepted.

Service information that applies to this AD may be obtained from the Piper Aircraft Corporation, Customer Services, 2926 Piper Drive, Vero Beach, Florida 32960. This information also may be examined at the Rules Docket at the address above.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Christina Marsh, Aerospace Engineer, FAA, Atlanta Aircraft Certification Office, Campus Building, 1701 Columbia Avenue, suite 2–160, College Park, Georgia 30337–2748; telephone (404) 305–7362; facsimile (404) 305–7348.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Comments Invited

Interested persons are invited to participate in the making of the proposed rule by submitting such written data, views, or arguments as they may desire. Communications should identify the Rules Docket number and be submitted in triplicate to the address specified above. All communications received on or before the closing date for comments, specified above, will be considered before taking action on the proposed rule. The proposals contained in this notice may be changed in light of the comments received.

Comments are specifically invited on the overall regulatory, economic, environmental, and energy aspects of the proposed rule. All comments submitted will be available, both before and after the closing date for comments, in the Rules Docket for examination by interested persons. A report that summarizes each FAA-public contact concerned with the substance of this proposal will be filed in the Rules Docket.

Commenters wishing the FAA to acknowledge receipt of their comments submitted in response to this notice must submit a self-addressed, stamped postcard on which the following statement is made: ''Comments to Docket No. 95–CE–29–AD.'' The postcard will be date stamped and returned to the commenter.

Availability of NPRMs

Any person may obtain a copy of this NPRM by submitting a request to the FAA, Central Region, Office of the Assistant Chief Counsel, Attention: Rules Docket No. 95–CE–29–AD, Room 1558, 601 E. 12th Street, Kansas City, Missouri 64106.

Discussion

Following the Piper Model PA–46–350P airplane power plant review, the FAA realized that the vibration approval for the Hartzell propeller Model HC–12YR–1 (BF) and Lycoming engine model TIO–540–AE2A contains a manifold pressure restriction, as follows:

''Do not exceed 36 inches manifold pressure below 2,400 RPM and 32 inches manifold pressure below 2,300 RPM.''

These restrictions fall outside the normal continuous operation range of the engine; therefore testing was not performed in this area during original type certification and the vibratory stress levels are unknown. The FAA has determined that (1) it is possible for the airplane to register these lower revolutions per minute (r.p.m.) combinations while operating at these high manifold pressure limits; and (2) the airplane operator should observe the limitations discussed above.

On March 29, 1995, Piper revised page 2–16 of Revision 14 (PR950329) to Report: VB–1332 of the PA–46–350P Pilots' Operating Handbook (POH). This POH revision references revised paragraph 2.35 regarding placards, specifically a placard containing manifold pressure limits. This revision is also referenced in Piper Service Bulletin No. 982, dated April 3, 1995.

After examining the circumstances and reviewing all available information related to the subject described above, the FAA has determined that AD action should be taken to prevent fatigue damage to the propeller caused by operating above certain manifold pressure limits.

Since an unsafe condition has been identified that is likely to exist or develop in other Piper Model PA–46–350P airplanes of the same type design, the proposed AD would require installing to the right of the manifold pressure gauge in full view of the pilot a placard that specifies manifold pressure limits. The proposed action would also require incorporating revised page 2–16 (dated March 29, 1995) of Revision 14 (PR950329) to Report: VB–1332 into the Limitations Section of the PA–46–350P POH. Piper Service Bulletin No. 982, dated April 3, 1995, contains the placard, and instructions on installing the placard and incorporating the POH revision. An owner/operator who holds a private pilot's certificate as authorized by sections 43.7 and 43.11 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR 43.7 and 43.11) may perform these actions.

The compliance time of the proposed AD is presented in calendar time instead of hours time-in-service. Although the unsafe condition develops as result of airplane usage, it cannot develop unless the manifold pressure limits specified in the proposed action are exceeded. Therefore, to ensure that all owners/operators of the affected airplanes incorporate the manifold pressure limits in a reasonable amount of time, a compliance based on calendar time is proposed.

The FAA estimates that 189 airplanes in the U.S. registry would be affected by the proposed AD, that it would take approximately 1 workhour per airplane to accomplish the proposed action. Since an owner/operator who holds a private pilot's certificate as authorized by sections 43.7 and 43.11 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR 43.7 and 43.11) can accomplish this action, the only impact this action would have upon the public is the time it takes each owner/operator to install the placard and incorporate the POH revision.

The regulations proposed herein would not have substantial direct effects on the States, on the relationship between the national government and the States, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities among the various levels of government. Therefore, in accordance with Executive Order 12612, it is determined that this proposal would not have sufficient federalism implications to warrant the preparation of a Federalism Assessment.

For the reasons discussed above, I certify that this action (1) is not a ''significant regulatory action'' under Executive Order 12866; (2) is not a ''significant rule'' under DOT Regulatory Policies and Procedures (44 FR 11034, February 26, 1979); and (3) if promulgated, will not have a significant economic impact, positive or negative, on a substantial number of small entities under the criteria of the Regulatory Flexibility Act. A copy of the draft regulatory evaluation prepared for this action has been placed in the Rules Docket. A copy of it may be obtained by contacting the Rules Docket at the location provided under the caption **ADDRESSES**.

List of Subjects in 14 CFR Part 39

Air transportation, Aircraft, Aviation safety, Safety.

The Proposed Amendment

Accordingly, pursuant to the authority delegated to me by the Administrator, the Federal Aviation Administration proposes to amend part 39 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR part 39) as follows:

PART 39—AIRWORTHINESS DIRECTIVES

1. The authority citation for part 39 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 49 U.S.C. App. 1354(a), 1421 and 1423; 49 U.S.C. 106(g); and 14 CFR 11.89.

§ 39.13 [Amended]

2. Section 39.13 is amended by adding a new AD to read as follows:

Piper Aircraft Corporation: Docket No. 95–CE–29–AD.

Applicability: Model PA–46–350P airplanes, serial numbers 4622001 through 4622189, certificated in any category.

Note 1: This AD applies to each airplane identified in the preceding applicability provision, regardless of whether it has been modified, altered, or repaired in the area subject to the requirements of this AD. For airplanes that have been modified, altered, or repaired so that the performance of the requirements of this AD is affected, the owner/operator must use the authority provided in paragraph (e) of this AD to request approval from the FAA. This approval may address either no action, if the current configuration eliminates the unsafe condition, or different actions necessary to address the unsafe condition described in this AD. Such a request should include an assessment of the effect of the changed configuration on the unsafe condition addressed by this AD. In no case does the presence of any modification, alteration, or repair remove any airplane from the applicability of this AD.

Compliance: Required within the next 2 calendar months after the effective date of this AD, unless already accomplished.

To prevent fatigue damage to the propeller caused by operating above certain manifold pressure limits, accomplish the following:

(a) Install to the right of the manifold pressure gauge in full view of the pilot a placard that specifies the following manifold pressure limits:

DO NOT EXCEED

36″ MP

BELOW 2400 RPM

32″ MP

BELOW 2300 RPM

Accomplish this installation in accordance with Piper Service Bulletin No. 982, dated April 3, 1995. This placard is included with the referenced service bulletin.

(b) Incorporate revised page 2–16 (dated March 29, 1995) of Revision 14 (PR950329) to Report: VB–1332 into the Limitations Section of the PA–46–350P Pilots' Operating Handbook. Piper Service Bulletin No. 982, dated April 3, 1995, contains the instructions for incorporating this POH revision.

(c) Installing the placard and incorporating the POH revision as required by this AD may be performed by the owner/operator holding at least a private pilot certificate as authorized by section 43.7 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR 43.7), and must be entered into the aircraft records showing compliance with this AD in accordance with section 43.11 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR 43.11).

(d) Special flight permits may be issued in accordance with sections 21.197 and 21.199 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR 21.197 and 21.199) to operate the airplane to a location where the requirements of this AD can be accomplished.

(e) An alternative method of compliance or adjustment of the compliance time that provides an equivalent level of safety may be approved by the Manager, Atlanta Aircraft Certification Office (ACO), Campus Building, 1701 Columbia Avenue, suite 2–160, College Park, Georgia 30337–2748. The request shall be forwarded through an appropriate FAA Maintenance Inspector, who may add comments and then send it to the Manager, Atlanta ACO.

Note 2: Information concerning the existence of approved alternative methods of compliance with this AD, if any, may be obtained from the Atlanta ACO.

(f) All persons affected by this directive may obtain copies of the POH revision, placard, and service information referred to herein upon request to Piper Aircraft Corporation, Customer Services, 2926 Piper Drive, Vero Beach, Florida 32960; or may examine these documents at the FAA, Central Region, Office of the Assistant Chief Counsel, Room 1558, 601 E. 12th Street, Kansas City, Missouri 64106.

Issued in Kansas City, Missouri, on May 26, 1995.

Henry A. Armstrong,

Acting Manager, Small Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. 95–13621 Filed 6–2–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–U

14 CFR Part 39

[Docket No. 95–CE–23–AD]

Airworthiness Directives; Beech Aircraft Corporation Models 60 and A60 Airplanes

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration, DOT.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM).

SUMMARY: This document proposes to adopt a new airworthiness directive (AD) that would apply to certain Beech Aircraft Corporation (Beech) Models 60 and A60 airplanes. The proposed action would require incorporating flight manual supplement revisions into the Airplane Flight Manual (AFM) that would specify a minimum airspeed for operating the affected airplanes in icing conditions. Reports of several incidents and accidents on the affected airplanes related to flight in icing conditions prompted the proposed action. The actions specified by the proposed AD are intended to prevent loss of control of the airplane because of the airplane traveling too slow in icing conditions.

DATES: Comments must be received on or before August 4, 1995.

ADDRESSES: Submit comments in triplicate to the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), Central Region, Office of the Assistant Chief Counsel, Attention: Rules Docket No. 95–CE–23–AD, Room 1558, 601 E. 12th Street, Kansas City, Missouri 64106. Comments may be inspected at this location between 8 a.m. and 4 p.m., Monday through Friday, holidays excepted.

Service information that applies to the proposed AD may be obtained from the Beech Aircraft Corporation, P.O. Box 85, Wichita, Kansas 67201–0085. This information also may be examined at the Rules Docket at the address above.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Bennett L. Sorensen, Flight Test Pilot, FAA, Wichita Aircraft Certification Office, 1801 Airport Road, Room 100, Wichita, Kansas 67209; telephone (316) 946–4165; facsimile (316) 946–4407.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Comments Invited

Interested persons are invited to participate in the making of the proposed rule by submitting such written data, views, or arguments as they may desire. Communications should identify the Rules Docket number and be submitted in triplicate to the address specified above. All communications received on or before the closing date for comments, specified above, will be considered before taking action on the proposed rule. The proposals contained in this notice may be changed in light of the comments received.

Comments are specifically invited on the overall regulatory, economic, environmental, and energy aspects of the proposed rule. All comments submitted will be available, both before and after the closing date for comments, in the Rules Docket for examination by interested persons. A report that summarizes each FAA-public contact concerned with the substance of this proposal will be filed in the Rules Docket.

Commenters wishing the FAA to acknowledge receipt of their comments submitted in response to this notice must submit a self-addressed, stamped postcard on which the following statement is made: ''Comments to Docket No. 95–CE–23–AD.'' The postcard will be date stamped and returned to the commenter.

Availability of NPRMs

Any person may obtain a copy of this NPRM by submitting a request to the FAA, Central Region, Office of the Assistant Chief Counsel, Attention: Rules Docket No. 95–CE–23–AD, Room 1558, 601 E. 12th Street, Kansas City, Missouri 64106.

Discussion

The FAA has received reports of four icing-related occurrences (one incident and three fatal accidents) involving Beech Models 60 and A60 airplanes. Investigation of these occurrences revealed that, in two of the accidents, the airplane was traveling too slow for icing conditions.

The Model 60 and A60 Pilot's Operating Handbook/Airplane Flight Manual (POH/AFM), including the FAA-approved sections, contains no specification or precautionary performance advisory regarding the appropriate minimum airspeed to maintain while operating in icing conditions.

Beech recently issued AFM supplement ''FLIGHT IN KNOWN ICING CONDITIONS'', Revised: January 1995, part number (P/N) 60–590001–17. This AFM supplement establishes a minimum airspeed for operating Beech Models 60 and A60 airplanes in icing conditions.

After examining the circumstances and reviewing all available information related to the incidents described above, the FAA has determined that AD action should be taken to prevent loss of control of the airplane because of the airplane traveling too slow in icing conditions.

Since an unsafe condition has been identified that is likely to exist or develop in other Beech Models 60 and A60 airplanes of the same type design, the proposed AD would require incorporating AFM supplement ''FLIGHT IN KNOWN ICING CONDITIONS'', Revised: January 1995, part number (P/N) 60–590001–17, into the applicable AFM.

The compliance time of the proposed AD is presented in calendar time instead of hours time-in-service. Although the unsafe condition develops as a result of airplane usage, it cannot develop unless the airplane travels too slow in icing conditions. Therefore, to ensure that all owners/operators of the affected airplanes incorporate the minimum airspeed in icing conditions flight manual supplement revisions in a reasonable amount of time, a compliance based on calendar time is proposed.

The FAA estimates that 243 airplanes in the U.S. registry would be affected by the proposed AD, that it would take less than 1 workhour per airplane to accomplish the proposed action. Since an owner/operator who holds a private pilot's certificate as authorized by sections 43.7 and 43.11 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR 43.7 and 43.11) can accomplish this action, the